

## TADASHI YAMAMOTO

If it had not been for a dramatic change in the system of governance in Asia Pacific countries in recent years, it is doubtful that we would be compiling this report on the subject of “the governance and organizational effectiveness of the nonprofit sector.” Nor could we have held a conference on this topic that brought together a prestigious group of individuals who are directly involved, or intensely interested, in the vibrant growth of civil society organizations in the region. In short, the forces of globalization have brought about a situation where governments have started sharing more of the processes of governance with nonprofit organizations, with a clear—though sometimes grudging—admission that government alone cannot cope with today’s increasingly complex socioeconomic issues. As civil society organizations started participating in the governance of society, filling the ever growing portion of “public interest” that has been conceded by governments, new questions have arisen in these countries about the legitimacy of that new and enhanced role of civil society. A related line of questioning has also been heard—with even greater frequency—about the capacity of these organizations to effectively undertake tasks that were once the exclusive domain of the public sector.

We are interested in governance at two levels: (a) public governance and (b) organizational (or internal) governance. With respect to public governance, we are interested in the relationship between the nonprofit sector and the State, the nonprofit sector and the market, and the nonprofit sector and the general public.

Our assumption is that the word “governance” connotes a departure from the traditional pattern of “governing” and assumes that civil society organizations will participate in the protection and promotion of public interests. We want to explore, then, if public governance consists of the following elements, what is the appropriate

role of civil society organizations in each of these elements:

- Setting social priorities: the authority and capacity to define and solve public problems. That is, who defines the public interest?
- Mediation among and resolution of competing societal interests
- Authoritative allocation of public goods and resources
- Deciding who participates in decision-making

With respect to the internal governance of nonprofit organizations, it is necessary, but not sufficient, to focus just on the role of governance structures such as boards of trustees. We want to look more broadly at the following elements of internal governance:

- Structures and processes to define organizational purposes and goals
- Structure and effectiveness of organizational management
- The relationship between internal organizational governance and program effectiveness
- The role of internal governance in ensuring financial sustainability and the appropriate use of funds
- The role of governance in complying with legal and administrative regulations
- The role of governance in relation to public disclosure of organizational purposes, management, financing, programs, and impact—even when that is not required by law or common practice.

The papers contained in this report, which were commissioned to authors from 12 Asia Pacific countries/regions, make evident this linkage between the improvement of the governance of society, on one hand, and the improvement of internal governance of civil society organizations, on the other. In fact, this linkage has raised many challenging questions for those involved in the work of furthering the role of NGOs and philanthropies in this region. Clearly, the biggest challenge for the civil society sector is how to forge a new relationship with the public sector in a situation where it has become a major actor in the governance of society at large. Related to this question is how the civil society sector can organize itself to establish a viable position in the governance of society, and to enable it to collaborate on a more equal footing with other sectors including the public sector, the corporate sector, and the media. Needless to say, it is imperative for civil society organizations to find ways to establish the kind of internal governance that will validate their participation in the governance of society in an effective and sustainable manner.

The papers presented for this comparative project have responded to many of these questions in a very effective and significant manner. On the other hand, I believe the papers have raised additional questions that should be further explored in the coming years through collaborative work within the Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium (APPC) as well as in other contexts. The Asia Pacific region is characterized by its diversity in terms of cultural backgrounds, political systems, and stages of socioeconomic development. Similarly, the levels and modalities of civil society development vary greatly. Nonetheless, one overriding commonality is the dynamic growth of civil society throughout the region, and the challenge for that sector to make a substantial contribution to the exploration of a new system of governance in each country/ region. This provides extremely fertile ground for productive sharing of experiences and information among the nonprofit organizations of the region on how civil society is trying to respond to the new challenges respectively and collectively.

One special feature of this collaborative APPC project is that most of the authors have been directly involved in civil society organizations or, even as academicians, have firsthand experience in the activities of these organizations. Moreover, each author has worked closely with a domestic committee in his or her country/ region that was specifically organized for this project to provide the perspectives of diverse sectors. Also, in each country/region two or three seminars were convened to elicit broad-based discussion as well as input for their research. As such, this project is not an academic exercise, but is very much an action-oriented endeavor, reflecting a keen sense of urgency on the part of those working to promote civil society in Asia Pacific. They believe that collective exploration and sharing of experiences and information among themselves will help them be better prepared to meet the challenges of the new era.

## II. The Emergence of Civil Society as a Major Actor in Domestic Governance

Before proceeding to the critical question of the relationship between the nonprofit sector and the public sector in the new sociopolitical context in Asia Pacific, it is useful to briefly review the characteristics of the emergence of NGOs and philanthropies in this region on the basis of the papers prepared for this comparative study.

It has to be stressed again that the countries in the Asia Pacific region are quite diverse in many respects, including cultural heritage, religious background, stage of economic development, degree of democratization, and form of government. Yet, as noted above, most of the countries in the region have witnessed the extremely

rapid growth of their civil society in recent years, described by one author as bamboo shoots sprouting up after the rain. As background to such development, the authors invariably refer to a growing recognition in recent years of the limits to government's ability to cope with the numerous and increasingly complex socioeconomic issues facing their country/ region. As a result, government bureaucrats have started turning to civil society organizations to shoulder greater responsibility in serving the public interest.

- The China paper, for example, reports that with the reform of state-owned enterprises and of the entire economic system, and with the transition from a planned economy to a market economy, the government is no longer able to bear the social burdens anymore. As a result, the government is gradually delegating responsibility to society through community organizations, social organizations, and other similar groups.
- The Taiwan paper also reports that civil society organizations have become more involved in providing services directly to disadvantaged groups, thus taking on a responsibility that had previously been exclusively assumed by the government.
- In Bangladesh, where a robust growth of civil society organizations in many areas of intervention, such as micro-credit, empowerment of women, population control, and non-formal primary education has gained global attention, there is a growing recognition of the sector's important contribution to development, especially for the poor, vulnerable, and disadvantaged sections of the society.

On the other hand, these and other writers point out that one major characteristic of the recent surge of civil society in Asia Pacific is that many of the civil society organizations have been transforming themselves from traditional organizations that provide contributions and services to the disadvantaged to organizations that directly involve themselves in the development process or in addressing diverse social issues.

- The chapter on Indonesia reports that, in order to engage more effectively in promoting equitable public policy, Indonesian NGOs have grouped themselves together in a number of coalitions to carry out advocacy efforts to change, influence, and/or draft new laws. It is also reported that NGOs are viewed by some in the government as alternative institutions with the ability to provide public services and at the same time serve as a check on government power.
- In Hong Kong, civil society organizations have long undertaken functions of service delivery, advocacy (not in a political sense, but only for the needs of

The Pakistan paper points out that with growing size and increased organization has come increased recognition and influence of the civil society sector. At the rhetorical level, at least, almost all official social planning documents emphasize the desire of the government to partner with the nonprofit sector for the alleviation of poverty.

The chapter on the Philippines reminds us of the impact of “people power” in that country’s governance. The government’s recognition of NGOs as an extension of “people power” was enshrined in the provisions of the Philippine constitution. Civil society in the Philippines has continued to show great influence in the development of the country, and its power has been manifested not only in policy advocacy but even in the peaceful ouster of a corrupt president.

### III. Response of Governments to the Growing Role of Civil Society in the Governance of Society



public interests go untended, there are political repercussions), but at the same time there is apprehension regarding the rapid rise of a sector that has at times flexed its muscles in opposition to government. In a sense, governments have shown signs at times that they want to harness that new power for their own purposes rather than allowing themselves to become reliant on civil society. There is thus a growing concern among civil society leaders in the region that the government bureaucracy will attempt to recapture or strengthen their control over civil society organizations through regulatory actions that ostensibly target the need for greater accountability and transparency in the nonprofit sector.

The reports on each country/region reveal a considerable divergence among government views of the growing role of civil society. It does not necessarily mean, however, that one country/region is more restrictive of civil society and the other is more lenient. There are cases of a government traditionally more positive toward NGOs and philanthropies shifting its position because of the continuing expansion and growing political influence of civil society.

Some of the papers point to the continuing efforts of the government bureaucracy to maintain or strengthen control over civil society. Growing pressure on civil society organizations from the public, the media, donors, and others to improve accountability and transparency on the grounds that they are major players have proven to be a convenient excuse for government bureaucrats to strengthen their control over NGOs and philanthropies. With the higher profile of the civil society sector, there inevitably have been more revelations of financial and other irregularities within civil society organizations that have made such government intervention appear to be natural and desirable.

- In the Philippines, the government has generally viewed NGOs as having high moral legitimacy, given their avowed purposes, the idealism and altruism of their leaders, their track record in social and political advocacy, and their guarded independence. However, in recent years, the government has become less certain about such assumptions. The Philippine government has begun to scrutinize NGOs for accountability and legitimacy, and is increasingly challenging the NGO community to regulate itself.
- In Australia, one of the implications of a benign legal environment has been that, for much of their history, many nonprofits were able to exist with little accountability to government even when they were receiving substantial government funding. This situation has changed in the last 20 years with an increased focus on public accountability.
- In Pakistan, the increased size and public profile of citizen organizations has inevitably led to increased scrutiny and criticism.

- While civil society organizations may face stronger government supervision their influence expands, at the same time there is undeniably growing support among government officials for civil society. This has led some of the governments in Asia Pacific to take an ambivalent attitude toward civil society organizations. Such an attitude is resulting in inconsistent regulatory and administrative contexts in some countries.

- Faced with such a situation where governments' perspectives on civil society are found in precarious balance, the authors in this comparative study project are unanimous in their opposition to stronger government control. A common concern is that stronger government supervision will undermine the critical contributions that civil society organizations have started making toward the better governance of their society. At the same time, there clearly is a growing sense of urgency among these civil society leaders in the region about the need to strengthen their own internal governance with greater emphasis on accountability and transparency.

- The Thailand paper contends that while the notion of having stronger and better enforced laws and regulations by the state to prevent misdeeds and abuses by the sector has been raised, most civil society members still believe that strict and strong legal measures will do more harm than good to the sector.
- The Taiwan paper asserts that the law is concerned with details that create unnecessary difficulties for the development of NPOs but that are useless in preventing abuse and raising accountability standards.
- The authors from the Philippines point out that most NGOs believe that regulation can best be assumed by the sector itself. Regulating NGOs through more government rules and policies is seen as a curtailment of NGO independence and flexibility.
- The Hong Kong paper maintains that excessive government regulatory measures and rules of funding bodies might even weaken corporate governance and that, “in short, the sector must learn to govern professionally but not to allow either professionalism or managerialism to dominate its agendas.”

The reactions of civil society leaders on the continuing or reinvigorated government interest to exert control over civil society organizations, such as cited above are natural and expected. Next, we will turn to the question of whether such concerns can truly be met by the efforts of civil society organizations themselves.

#### **IV. Civil Society Response—Improving Internal Governance**

What should be the response of civil society in Asia Pacific to the increasing questions, often posed in critical and skeptical tones, regarding the legitimacy, transparency, accountability, and organizational effectiveness of NGOs and philanthropies, as outlined in the previous sections? This is the central question that the APPC asked the authors and their respective national committees to address in this project. By sharing information on the nature of this new challenge and the responses being made in the countries participating in APPC, civil society organizations and those individuals working in this sector throughout Asia Pacific can consider various approaches and effective strategies for meeting the challenge.

The papers contained in this report offer diverse perspectives and certainly enrich the dialogue on and search for better strategies and approaches to improving internal governance. Given the complexity of the issues presented in these papers, however, it is not easy to draw any definitive conclusions on many of the issues. Nevertheless, this collaborative exploration has enabled us to more clearly identify the issues that must be tackled, to sharpen the questions to be asked, to devise





overtone of government control whenever the question of internal governance or accountability is emphasized. Partly in order to avoid such a tendency to reduce dynamic civil society organizations to a well-behaved and process-conscious existence, these issues should be discussed in connection with purpose-oriented organizational effectiveness. This is also related to the question of what should be included in a code of conduct, self-certification, and other efforts to enhance internal governance, which we will return to below. As the Indonesia paper points out, “NGOs’ programs or activities should be based on ideal values that are described in the organization’s vision, mission and strategic objectives,” and “these moral values should also be formalized as a code of ethics to guide the NGO in determining what is right or wrong.” To many of the practitioners in civil society in Asia Pacific, enhanced internal governance seems to be understood as their ability to account for their organization’s mission and their commitment to their constituencies and stakeholders, being equipped with a competent and transparent management and structure of governance.

## ***(2) Accountable Management Structure and Effective Organizational Efforts***

From the outset of this joint study and dialogue project, the subject of the roles and functions of boards of trustees and directors has been emphasized. Indeed, it is commonly understood that, as the Philippine paper points out, boards have overall accountability for the governance of their respective organizations, and this certainly is a subject that is central to this project. In most of the papers, however, one does not get a clear sense that the boards in civil society organizations in Asia Pacific are functioning effectively. Most of the papers emphasize the importance of providing the board members of civil society organizations with an appropriate orientation program when they are appointed, with training programs on a regular basis, and with briefings on their fiduciary role and other fundamental aspects of running of civil society organizations. But most of the paper writers also point to problems in the selection and recruitment processes, where friends of the founders (including former government officials) are given higher priority, and they cite low attendance at the board meetings, poor functioning of boards, and inadequate collaboration or interaction with managers and staff members.

Even more broadly, several of the papers question, at least implicitly, the applicability of imported governance models to the diverse circumstances of Asia, and in particular, an almost exclusive focus on the role of governing boards.

- The Japan paper reports that research done by the Japan Association of Charitable Corporations (JACO) showed that often the board of trustees was a

The Philippine paper similarly states that most NGO boards are nominal, inactive, and/or disinterested in their governance functions.

The Hong Kong paper maintains that board members of nonprofit organizations are often trustees who serve the interests of service beneficiaries who often cannot stand up for their own rights. The author reports that many board members participated in nonprofit activities simply out of a sense of community service, and did not realize that they are liable for fiduciary mismanagement.

The Bangladesh paper reports that the nature and composition of the board and/or executive committee of most of the NGOs are arbitrary, symbolic, and parochial, often dominated by family members, kith and kin, or a handful of like-minded persons.

In this connection, several background papers refer to the fact that many of the existing civil society organizations may be regarded as “first generation institutions” in that founders still yield considerable influence in their activities including fundraising, managing the relationship with the government and business, and coming up with programmatic directions. The paper writers offered assessments of this situation that were varied and, at best, inconclusive. The Korean author contends, for example, that “Korean civil society is confronted with the problem of charismatic founders and dominant government agencies,” and, that “in order to institutionalize well functioning internal governance structures based on checks and balances, more emphasis needs to be placed on internal constituents other than founders.” Others seem to contend that founder-driven organizations can be more creative and dynamic and are effective in achieving the stated mission.

It seems that some serious explorations are needed to come up with viable strategies to strengthen the management system, including the strengthening of boards. One can contend that, as the Taiwan paper points out, “many civil society organizations in the region have not reached a certain degree of maturity in their organizational structure and are entangled in a delicate balancing act to find sustainable ways to maintain their organizational development.” It can also be said that unless there is broader public awareness of the vital role of governing boards in internal governance, and particularly the board’s role in ensuring organizational autonomy, it may be unrealistic to build strong boards in the sociopolitical milieu of Asia Pacific region. In this sense, the fact that many civil society organizations have failed to build strong and effective boards is a reflection of the overall level of development of civil society in this region. Part of the solution to this dilemma may be for the surviving generation of founders of civil society in Asia Pacific to play out the final act of building a sustainable system of internal governance. One way to do this is to build more effective boards, both by using the kinds of resources and contacts they have built over the years, and by making sure that diverse views and future generations of leaders are represented.

### ***(3) Private Initiatives in Improving Internal Governance***

The papers report diverse initiatives by civil society in each country/ region represented in APPC, often led by umbrella organizations in those countries, to improve the internal governance of NGOs and philanthropies. Some of the initiatives have been undertaken at the urging of or even in cooperation with government agencies. Some may be regarded as innovative programs or best practices, but this integrative overview is not the place to evaluate them. Instead, what may be considered to be viable and promising initiatives as have been presented in the background papers are introduced here for general discussion. To the extent possible, some attempts are also made to provide general characteristics of what may be considered effective initiatives.

As an effective approach to improve the transparency and accountability of civil society organizations, programs making use of advanced communications technologies have been initiated in many countries in the region. Such technologies have also been used to facilitate communication among civil society organizations, among their respective members, and with citizens in general.

- The NPO Development Center of Taiwan helps nonprofit organizations by designing websites and intranets, and by teaching the staff basic techniques to apply IT tools to their operations. Similarly, the NPO Digital Village provides

training, common application software and consultant services, and in doing so, attempts to bring IT to NPOs that lack the financial resources.

- Taiwan has yet to have a website such as Guidestar in the United States, where information about the operations and finances of nonprofit organizations is readily accessible, but if legislation currently under consideration is approved, a similar website would be set up.
- The Japan NPO Center created a website, NPO Hiroba (Forum), in 2001 to offer a database on incorporated NPOs, centralizing the information submitted to government agencies in the 48 prefectural governments and the Cabinet Office.
- The Japan Association of Charitable Corporations (JACO) established a Site for Disclosure by Public Interest Corporations in January 2002 to promote self-initiated disclosure, and has been effective in promoting greater transparency among nonprofit organizations. (The Cabinet Office itself is also proposing to provide such information via the internet, as will be explained in the following section.)
- In Korea, Citizen's Action Network is utilizing new information and communications technology that can supplement the traditional decision making process. It uses the web-based technology to facilitate better communication among its members and uses it as a forum of discussion and collective decision making.

Several creative programs in the areas of promoting self-certification and the establishment of codes of conduct and codes of ethics have also been reported by the authors.<sup>1</sup> As discussed earlier, these initiatives have been taken in part to rebuild public trust in the aftermath of revelations of unethical conduct by some civil society organizations and to diffuse any attempts by government authorities to strengthen their control over civil society. Moreover, civil society leaders believe that strengthening internal governance can lead them to become more effective in achieving their mission and in meeting social needs.

- In the Philippines, the Caucus of Development NGO Networks (CODE-NGO) produced a Code of Ethics for NGOs in 1991, which is now subscribed to by close to 3000 NGO members of that network. The author notes that this code was one of the earliest attempts by an NGO community to establish provisions for self-regulation.

1 These initiatives are discussed in more detail in the paper prepared by Mark Sidel for this conference, "Trends in nonprofit self-regulation in the Asia Pacific region: Initial data on initiatives, experiments, and models in seventeen countries."

- In Indonesia, LP3ES, a well known national NGO, took the initiative in 2002 to prepare and implement a code of ethics, which was signed by over 250 NGOs. The code contains matters related to integrity, accountability and transparency, independence, anti-violence, gender equality, and financial management, including accountability to external parties such as beneficiaries, government, donors, other NGOs, and the public at large.
- A program called “Certification of Indonesian NGOs” is to be launched by the Satunama Foundation, and is designed to improve NGO public accountability and management performance.
- YAPPIKA, an Indonesian NGO alliance for civil society and democracy, has implemented a program starting in 2000 to assess the health of Indonesian civil society using the CIVICUS Index on Civil Society.
- The Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC), a networking organization, established guidelines for Japanese NGOs that were set forth in a Code of Conduct in 1994, and it continues to contribute to efforts to strengthen governance among NGOs. In the spring of 2002, JANIC created a committee on accountability that aims to set an NGO standard for accountability by September 2003.
- The Pakistan NGO Forum’s Code of Conduct was published in 1999 after a two-year consultative process. The increased emphasis of the government on financial transparency and holding NPOs accountable through the official machinery has resulted in NPO attempts to organize their own governance.
- The Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA) has developed codes of conduct for their members. The code encompasses conduct standards for boards that are more comprehensive than any others developed for nonprofit sector organizations. Adherence to this code by its member organizations is a prerequisite for government funding.
- In China, the Research Center for Volunteering and Welfare at Peking University is conducting a research project that seeks to measure organizational effectiveness of civil society organizations. The overall goal of this project is to help organizations manage their service programs better and to enhance their contributions to the local, national, and international community.
- In India, a self-regulating framework has been built by the nonprofit sector that establishes and promotes norms, and allows for certification or validation that the nonprofit organization concerned meets these norms.

- Many of these initiatives are relatively new, but they seem to reflect a strong desire by civil society leaders to promote their own internal governance and demonstrate their concern for organizational accountability and transparency. According to a study done by the author of the Australia paper, “they seem to believe strict and strong legal measures will do more harm than good to the sector.”

In the preceding sections, we have discussed the need to improve the internal governance of civil society organizations—including enhanced accountability and transparency of their activities—as they strive to meet the new expectations placed on them as they become major actors in the governance of society and country/region. In following the structure of the project and the suggested outline of the country/region papers, I have given separate treatment to the government responses and the civil society responses to this new situation of greater civil society participation in the governance of society. While this may give a picture of a pronounced dichotomy between the public sector and the nonprofit sector in dealing with the new situation, the papers do suggest emerging patterns of collaboration or even partnership between the public sector and the nonprofit sector in bringing about a better system of governance of society and, at the same time, in strengthening the internal governance of civil society organizations.

- As noted above, the Japanese Cabinet Office has announced its intention to disclose on the internet all financial and programmatic information for the approximately 900 incorporated NPOs under its jurisdiction by March 2004. As the Japanese government prepares for the implementation of an e-government, procedures concerning NPOs, including the filing for application and reporting, will be handled online, which should facilitate disclosure.
- In Pakistan, mindful of the past history of reform efforts, the government launched a new kind of initiative in late 2001 called the “Enabling Environmental Initiative (EEI).” This new approach reflected the government’s

recognition that it wanted to partner with civil society for social development and poverty alleviation and that regulatory reform efforts should be aimed at achieving that goal. The government wanted to improve the transparency and accountability of citizen organizations without compromising their autonomy. To do this, the government wanted to come up with reform proposals in consultation with all the stakeholders, especially with the citizen sector.

- In the Philippines, the Department of Finance challenged the NGO community to establish a self-regulatory mechanism and body, which could certify the legitimacy, accountability, and transparency of NGOs, and especially those receiving donations from individuals or corporations in the Philippines. Only those NGOs so certified would receive the status of a “donee institution.” In response to this challenge, six of the country’s largest national NGO networks jointly organized the Philippines Council for NGO Certification (PCNC) in 1997, during the formulation of the government’s Comprehensive Tax Reform Program.
- In Indonesia, the Yayasan Bill was ratified in 2001. This was considered to be an important breakthrough for good governance of the nonprofit sector in Indonesia, as it provided assurance and legal certainty, as well as restored the *yayasan*’s function as a nonprofit institution with social, religious, and humanitarian goals. Although this law has not been fully implemented, it will have a wide impact on the nonprofit sector in Indonesia, including NGOs, as 95 percent of them use *yayasan* as their legal status.

In other areas, the country/ region reports provide some encouraging signs of more positive attitudes of the governments in the region toward collaboration with civil society, acknowledging important contributions these organizations can provide to meet the increasing and challenging social needs. The Taiwan paper reports of “the change in the government’s perception of the third sector,” and states that “although the government’s attitude toward NPOs still remains somewhat ambivalent, there have been a growing number of efforts over the past few years on the part of some government agencies to help build the capacities of NPOs. Likewise, the Japan paper reports possible signs of the government’s change of attitude toward civil society organizations. In August 2002, the Japanese government announced its new policies toward the nonprofit organizations, almost reversing their strong control over public interest corporations. The author reports that the “new scheme announced delineated five aspects as a model framework for nonprofit organizations: streamlined incorporation process; more objective criteria for determining “public interest”; transparency of organizational management and activities; and flexibility in the framework to permit adjustments as necessary.”



There clearly is a growing recognition among the governments of the Asia Pacific nations about the critical contributions civil society organizations can make in improving the governance of their respective countries, and such positive assessments will doubtlessly be reinforced if the internal governance of civil society organizations can be strengthened and their organizational effectiveness can be further bolstered. In this sense, a more positive attitude on the part of government officials toward supporting and enhancing partnership with civil society organizations can be regarded as a natural development. On the other hand, the inclination of governments in Asia Pacific to regard civil society organizations to be their subsidiaries that have to be controlled and contained is likely to persist. The continued efforts of civil society organizations to prove their increasing contributions, and to promote better understanding among government officials about the advantages of forging effective partnerships will be essential in the coming years.

In this pursuit for better and more effective partnerships, the role played by umbrella organizations, peak bodies, network organizations, and the like is enthusiastically acknowledged by many country/ region paper writers. Many references have been made in this report to such organizations in connection with collective efforts to gain a more enabling environment from governments, to promote self-certification and codes of ethics and conduct, thus contributing to the improvement of internal governance, and to promote productive partnership with the public sector in diverse areas. Such catalytic roles of these umbrella organizations are not limited to individual countries. As the Asia Pacific region grows increasingly interdependent and moves toward becoming a regional community with common challenges to overcome and shared aspirations to pursue, there will be a greater role to be played by the Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium. The collegial spirit and intensive collaborative endeavors of this team of like-minded individuals from the APPC nations who have come together to undertake this action-oriented study on “Governance, Organizational Effectiveness, and the Nonprofit Sector” has demonstrated the profound meaning of regional collaboration through the APPC.

### Endnote:

For linguistic simplicity, we may occasionally refer throughout this work to the 12 countries/regions or sometimes “countries” participating in the study. We acknowledge, however, that Taiwan’s international status is a matter of dispute and that it is not generally recognized as an independent country.